

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

Application Serial No. ....10/825,832  
Filing Date ..... April 15, 2004  
Confirmation No.....9462  
Inventor.....Charles Wu  
Group Art Unit .....2157  
Examiner ..... Ashokkumar B Patel  
Attorney's Docket No. .... MS1-0347USC1\125333.03  
Title: System and Method for Synchronizing Objects Between Two Devices

**RESPONSE TO FINAL OFFICE ACTION DATED DECEMBER 8, 2005**

To: Mail Stop AF  
Commissioner for Patents  
PO Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

From: Mark Farrell (Tel. 509-324-9256; Fax 509-323-8979)  
Lee & Hayes, PLLC  
421 W. Riverside Ave., Suite 500  
Spokane, WA 99201

### **INTRODUCTORY COMMENTS**

This communication is in response to the Final Office Action dated December 8, 2005 with a 3-month period within which to reply. The claims of the present application were restricted from the parent application as a separate invention, and filed in the present application as a divisional. The parent application issued as U.S. Patent No. 6,862,617 on March 1, 2005.

A **Statement of Substance of Examiner Interview** begins on page 3 of this paper.

**Amendments to the Claims** begins on page 4 of this paper.

A **Listing of the Claims** begins on page 5 of this paper.

**Remarks** begin on page 8 of this paper.

STATEMENT OF SUBSTANCE OF EXAMINER INTERVIEW

of February 1, 2006 -- required under 37 CFR 1.133(b)

Administrative Details

Telephonic Interview With Examiner of February 1, 2006

Participants: Examiner Ashok Patel; and Mark Farrell, Lee & Hayes, PLLC

Issues Discussed

This summary comprises a complete and proper recordation of the substance of the interview as defined in MPEP § 713.04.

Applicant asked questions regarding double patenting rejection over parent application and possible use of terminal disclaimer.

On a second thought, Applicant suggested double patenting rejection was improper because instant application is a divisional application of the parent cited in the double patenting rejection.

Examiner stated that 35 USC section 102 rejection would probably have to be overcome in an Office Action response to gain allowance.

No agreement on the issues was committed to by either party.

**AMENDMENTS TO THE CLAIMS**

**In the Claims:**

Claims 1-5 are currently pending.

No claims are canceled.

No new claims are added.

Claims 1-5 are amended.

Claims 1-5 are currently pending.